

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 12 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sakashita (U.S. Patent No. 6,501,451).

Claims 3, 7, 8 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakashita.

Claims 4, 5, 9, 10, 13 and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and if amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant amends claims 1, 6 and 15 by this amendment. Claims 1-15 remain currently pending.

The Disposition of the Claims

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 4, 5, 9, 10, 13 and 14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and if amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection.

In addition, the remaining claims 1-3, 6-8, 11, 12 and 15 are also believed to be allowable for at least the following reasons.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Office Action asserts that the phrase “modulated data band,” as set forth in independent claims 1, 6 and 15, lacks antecedent basis. In addition, the Examiner suggests changing the claim language to further clarify the horizontal and vertical relations.

In response, Applicant amends independent claims 1, 6 and 15 by this Amendment. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-15, as amended, fully comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 6, 12 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sakashita, and claims 3, 7, 8 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakashita. These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully submits that Sakashita does not anticipate claims 1, 2, 6, 12 and 15 because Sakashita does not disclose every feature of these recited claims. For instance, Applicant respectfully submits that Sakashita fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination, as set forth in independent claim 1, including at least “carrying out first and second approximations based on the modulated data band to derive an approximate modulated data not registered in the look-up table, thereby modulating the source data using the approximate modulated data.” In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that Sakashita fails to teach or suggest the claimed combinations, as set forth in independent claims 6 and 15, including at least “a modulator approximating in the horizontal and vertical directions within the modulated data

band to derive an approximate modulated data not registered in the look-up table, thereby modulating the source data using the approximate modulated data.”

The Office Action asserts that Sakashita discloses the method of driving a liquid crystal display as set forth in claims 1, 6 and 15. In particular, the Office Action cites figure 8, column 6, lines 58-60 and column 8, lines 23-26 of Sakashita as disclosing two approximations used to derive an approximate modulated data not registered in the look-up table. However, none of these cited portions or other portions of Sakashita’s disclosure discusses deriving an approximate modulated data not registered in the look-up table or modulating the source data using an approximate modulated data not registered in the look-up table.

In contrast to Applicant’s claimed combinations as a whole, Sakashita discloses selecting an 8-bit correction data from a look-up table and outputting this 8-bit correction data to be added or subtracted from a current image signal. In particular, as shown in the LUT (205) in FIG. 8 of Sakashita, “when the level of the signal for the immediately preceding frame or field is 0000b, and the level of the current image signal is 0111b, a correction value of +31 (0001 1111b) is selected. By adding the correction value +31 to the current image signal by the adder-substrate 206 and applying the resultant signal to the liquid crystal display panel.” Column 8, lines 23-30 of Sakashita. Thus, Sakashita teaches extracting a correction value from a look-up table and modifying an image signal with such a correction value. Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that the method of Sakashita does not carry out first and second approximations based on a modulated data band and does not modulate a source data using an approximate modulated data not registered in a look-up table. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that the device of Sakashita does not include a modulator approximating within a modulated data band or a

modulator modulating a source data using an approximate modulated data not registered in a look-up table.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Sakashita fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination, as set forth in independent claim 1, including at least “carrying out first and second approximations based on the modulated data band to derive an approximate modulated data not registered in the look-up table, thereby modulating the source data using the approximate modulated data.” In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that Sakashita fails to teach or suggest the claimed combinations, as set forth in independent claims 6 and 15, including at least “a modulator approximating in the horizontal and vertical directions within the modulated data band to derive an approximate modulated data not registered in the look-up table, thereby modulating the source data using the approximate modulated data.”

M.P.E.P. §2131 states “[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.” Applicant respectfully submits that since Sakashita does not teach or suggest every feature of independent claims 1, 6 and 15, Sakashita does not anticipate claims 1, 6 and 15. In addition, since claims 2 and 12 depend from claim 1 and 6, respectively, it is respectfully submitted that Sakashita also does not anticipate claims 2 and 12. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 6, 12, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

Further, M.P.E.P. §2143.03 instructs that “[t]o establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).” Since claims 3, 7, 8 and 11 depend from claim 1 or 6, it is respectfully submitted that Sakashita also does not render claims 3, 7, 8 and 11 unpatentable. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3, 7, 8 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited. Should there remain any questions or comments regarding this response or the application in general, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____

Victoria D. Hao

Registration No. 47,630

Dated: November 8, 2004

Customer No.: 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: 202.739.3000

Facsimile: 202.739.3001